THE SUPREME COURT

LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT U. S.

OF THE

UNITED STATES

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
MAY 19 1969
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

October Term, [redacted] 1969

No. [redacted] 133

WALTER S. COOPER, Plaintiff and Appellant, vs. LESLIE SALT COMPANY, et al., Defendants and Respondents,	California Supreme Court Number S. F. No. 22616
WALTER S. COOPER, Plaintiff and Appellant, vs. T. JACK FOSTER, et al., Defendants and Respondents.	California Supreme Court Number S. F. No. 22617
WALTER S. COOPER, Plaintiff and Appellant, vs. ESTERO MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT, et al., Defendants and Appelants, T. JACK FOSTER, et al., Interveners and Respondents.	California Supreme Court Number S. F. No. 22619

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FUNSTEN & CALDWELL
JAMES W. FUNSTEN and DAVID B. CALDWELL
235 Montgomery Street, Room 404
San Francisco, California 94104
ATTORNEYS FOR PETITIONER

SUBJECT INDEX

Topic 2
CITATION TO OPINIONS OF THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT 3
STATEMENT OF GROUNDS ON WHICH JURISDICTION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES IS INVOKED 3
QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW 5
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS, STATUTES, AND ORDINANNCES WHICH THE CASE INVOLVES 5
STATEMENT OF THE CASE 6
STATEMENT OF THE FACTS 14
ARGUMENT 14
I - Constitutionality of the Estero Act 16
II - Voting Rights of Petitioner 18
III - Right of Petitioner that the Land Developer Account to the Estero District 19
CONCLUSION

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

Authority

Cases

Avery vs. Midland County (1968) 390 U.S. 474 (20 L.Ed.2d 45, 88 S.Ct. 1114) 17
Brandenstein vs. Hoke (1894) 101 Cal. 131 (35 P.562) . .
Cooper vs. Estero Municipal Improvement District (1969) 70 Advance 687, 75 California Reporter 777, 451 Pacific 2nd 417 14
2,6
Cooper vs. Leslie Salt Company (1969) 70 Advance California 669, 75 California Reporter 766, 451 Pacific 2nd 406 . . . . . 2,6,7,8, 9,14,17,
Gilbert vs. Stockton Port District (1936) 7 Cal. 2nd 384 (60 P. 2d 847 14
Miller & Lux vs. Board of Supervisors (1922) 189 Cal. 254 (208 Pac 304) 14,15

Constitutions

California Constitution, Article 2, Section 24 12
California Constitution, Article 4, Section 31 12,16
California Constitution, Article 11, Section 6 10
Magna Carta, Section 15 16
United States Constitution, 14th Amendment, Due Process Clause 4,5, 10,19
United States Constitution, 14th Amendment, Equal Protection Clause 3,4, 5, 12

Statutes & Codes

California Civil Code Section 2235 18
Estero Act, California Statues 1961, 1st Extra Session, 1960, Chapter 82, Page 459 4,5
Title 28 United States Code, Section 1257 3

Texts

Volume 3, Summary of California Law, Witkin, Pages 2390-2391 18
Volume 4, Summary of California Law, Witkin, Page 2929 18

Law Review

Willoughby, The Quiet Alliance, (1965) 38 Southern California Law Review 72 8,9

THE SUPREME COURT

OF THE

UNITED STATES

October Term, 1968

WALTER S. COOPER, Plaintiff and Appellant, vs. LESLIE SALT COMPANY, et al., Defendants and Respondents,	California Supreme Court Number S. F. No. 22616
WALTER S. COOPER, Plaintiff and Appellant, vs. T. JACK FOSTER, et al., Defendants and Respondents.	California Supreme Court Number S. F. No. 22617
WALTER S. COOPER, Plaintiff and Appellant, vs. ESTERO MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT, et al., Defendants and Appelants, T. JACK FOSTER, et al., Interveners and Respondents.	California Supreme Court Number S. F. No. 22619

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

The Petition of Walter S. Cooper for a Writ of Certiorari to review the judgments of the Supreme Court of the State of

California which were made in the above-entitled matters on March 20, 1969, is hereby respectfully presented.

CITATION TO OPINIONS OF THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT

The Opinion of the California Supreme Court in Cooper vs. Leslie Salt Company, et al., and Cooper vs. Foster, et al., appears as a consolidated opinion in the Official Advance Sheets of the Supreme Court of California at Volume 70 Advance California at Page 669. That Opinion also appears in Volume 75 of the West California Reporter at page 766, and in Volume 451 Pacific, 2nd Series, at page 406.

The Opinion of the California Supreme Court in Cooper vs. Estero Municipal Improvement District, et al., appears at Volume 70 Advance California at Page 687. That Opinion also appears in Volume 75 of West California Reporter at Page 777, and volume 451 Pacific, 2nd Series, at Page 417.

On April 17, 1969, the Supreme Court of the State of California denied a re-hearing in Cooper vs. Leslie Salt Company and Cooper vs. Foster, and at the same time the California Supreme Court modified the Opinion in those matters to substitute the word "twenty-two" in place of the word "two" on page 678 at line 14 of the Opinion as it appears in Volume 70 Advance California. Also on April 17, 1969, the California Supreme Court denied a re-hearing in Cooper vs. Estero, and at the same time the California Supreme Court modified the Opinion in Cooper vs. Estero by striking the words "the association" which appear on page 691 at lines 14 and 15 of the Opinion in that matter as it appears in Volume 70 Advance California.

Each said Opinion, showing said Modifications, is set forth at the end of this Petition. By this Petition for Writ of Certiorari, Petitioner seeks a review by the United States Supreme Court of each of the aforesaid Decisions of the Supreme Court of the State of California.

STATEMENT OF GROUNDS ON WHICH JURISDICTION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES IS INVOKED

The date and time of filing of both judgments of the Supreme Court of the State of California for which petitioner seeks review is March 20, 1969.

The date of the Order Denying a Re-Hearing in each of said cases was April 17, 1969.

Petitioner in seeking review by the Supreme Court of the United States of the afore-described decisions of the Supreme Court of the State of California, relies upon Title 28 United States Code, Section 1257, which provides in part:

> "Final judgments or decrees rendered by the highest court of a State in which a decision could be had, may be reviewed by the Supreme Court as follows:
>
> ". . .
>
> "(3) By writ of certiorari, . . . where the validity of a State statute is drawn in question on the ground of its being repugnant to the Constitution, treaties or laws of the United States, or where any title, right, privilege or immunity is specially set up or claimed under the Constitution, treaties or statutes of. . . the United States."

THE QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

The questions presented by the Petition for review in the Supreme Court of the United States are, expressed in concise terms, as follows:

I. Is the State of California denying the Petitioner his right under the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution to equal protection of the laws where two-fifths of the voting power of his local government is granted to landowners only, one vote per dollar of assessed valuation, and that government is a government of general powers including the power to maintain a police department, to enact penal statutes, to lay and collect real and personal property taxes, to issue unlimited